



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Even the varying forms of the Early and Middle English are given with absolute correctness. On page 177, Dr. Jespersen has introduced a very useful phonetic term into Danish, *stømmelse* (voicing), for which his apologetic foot note is hardly necessary. The discussion of the confusion in the use of the nominative and objective is particularly sound and valuable for Danish readers. It is somewhat in the nature of a defence of the position taken by the author in his English grammar, for the schoolmaster is abroad in Denmark as well as in America. Jespersen's treatment of the Scandinavian influence on Old English (p. 97) is remarkably temperate for a Dane. His suggestion that Einkenel's frequently excessive claims for French influence on English syntax may often be disproved by citing similar Danish constructions, is valuable, even though, as he himself admits, such resemblances do not necessarily imply direct Scandinavian influence. Not the least virtue of the work is the admirable table of contents, which almost takes the place of an index. Dr. Jespersen's second series will be looked forward to with interest.

DANIEL KILHAM DODGE.

University of Illinois.

POETRY AND PHILOSOPHY.

Kuno Fischer und die litterarhistorische Methode. Von HUGO FALKENHEIM, DR. PHIL. Berlin: Speyer & Peters, 1892, pp. 107.

THE object of Falkenheim's monograph, as set forth in the Preface, is to attempt to establish the principles of a method which shall be a guide to a scientific understanding and appreciation of German poetry. Its rather strange title is due to the fact, that the author believes to have discovered these principles in the critical works of Kuno Fischer on Lessing, Schiller and Goethe. The title is not a happy one, as it may arouse the opposition of some critics to whom Kuno Fischer is not a *persona grata*; furthermore, it is misleading. For the value of the essay lies in the principles of literary criticism deduced from Fischer's books, and not in the discussion and analysis of Fischer's methods.

It would be impossible within the limits of a

book review to discuss, or even comment upon, principles of such far-reaching importance, for this would require at least as much space as the author has taken for their exposition. As such a method, however, cannot be limited to German literature, but is universal in its application, it will not be without value to follow the main lines of the views here presented, in the hope that the presentation of these may lead to a careful reading of the book, which is full of suggestions on all matters pertaining to the critical study of literature, though all might not agree with its chief deductions.

The author asserts, as the underlying principle of his method, that poetry and philosophy are intimately connected in their nature. This principle he demonstrates by an analysis of the character of both, and by the fact, that so many German poets have written purely philosophical works, and that all poets have embodied in their poetic creations great philosophic principles, and in their poetry have touched upon all the great problems of human life. Therefore, without the foundation of a knowledge of philosophy, the domains of classical German literature cannot be explored in their full extent; and, if literary criticism rejects philosophic thinking, that is, the philosophic method, it cannot rise to the full appreciation of its problems, and, hence, cannot solve them. The study of the history of literature is a philosophic process; it consists in investigating the principles of the internal development and the organic growth of literature. He who would write a history of literature must combine the qualities of the historian, of the psychologist and of the literary critic pure and simple. Every author must be considered from three standpoints. He must be viewed in relation to his nation; must be assigned his proper place in the history of that nation's literature and civilization. He must be discussed as the man, as a personality. He must be considered as the poet, or rather his works must be judged by themselves as artistic productions, and criticised from the purely literary standpoint. The relative importance of these elements of literary judgment varies, but they all require consideration.

Now, in regard to the first point. No judg-

ment can be fairly passed upon any author without a clear understanding of his relations to his nation and to his own times; whether or not he is in sympathy with the spirit of the times, and how far he helps to solve its great problems and to advance the cause of civilization and progress. To such an understanding, a thoroughly philosophical knowledge of that nation's history is necessary, particularly of its literary history. The great poets stand for and embody, so to speak, that which is greatest and best in their times, and, like heirs, take up and carry forward the work of civilization from one generation to another in unbroken succession. There is then a historical dependence of poets upon another, which shows itself in similar views, in similar subjects, in similar *motifs*, which are transmitted from one to another, perhaps directly borrowed. But the present tendency to attach such great importance to the discovery of such similarities is utterly wrong. For, from a strictly historical standpoint, such discoveries are of value only as they throw light upon the state of thought and culture of the period in question, or upon the general trend of the intellectual life of the nation.

But the poet has an existence and a history apart from that of his nation. To pass judgment upon him, it is, therefore, necessary to know him as an individual personality, as a "spiritual monad," and to know his personal development. Two things are necessary to such knowledge: a psychological analysis of the poet's inborn character and talents; and further, a detailed knowledge of his antecedents and of the facts of his personal history. The mere knowledge of facts, without any understanding of their bearing upon the development of the author as a man and poet, is fruitless; and the collection and compilation of such facts is almost useless labor.

In regard to the relation existing between the external facts of a poet's life and his poetry, Falkenheim holds, that poetry is the expression of the inward life of the poet and not mere reproduction of impressions from nature. All impressions from the outside world pass through the prism of poetic imagination and receive their coloring from this. Many writers on literature utterly fail to ap-

preciate this, and are lead to commit all kinds of extravagances in their attempts to fix minutely the persons who have furnished traits for the poet's characters, or to establish the exact scenes of his poems. The critic needs a philosophical mind to appreciate the transforming power of poetic fancy, to estimate correctly the influence of external events upon the development of the poet's genius, to recognize the close relation between life and poetry without binding himself to the dogma, that art and poetry merely reproduce nature and do nothing more.

A poet's life and his works, however, stand in a close relation, inasmuch as the latter are the result of agitated states of the mind, which seeks by poetic creation to free itself from its passions. Therefore, all poetry is a "Confession" and, to understand the poet's soul-life and inner development, it is necessary to analyse his poetry with this fact in view. Such psychological analysis, moreover, frequently establishes the relations between different poems, or parts of the same poem, with greater certainty than can be reached by external evidence. External evidence is of value, but how misleading it may prove is shown by the great mistakes which have been made in the discussion of the "Faust-question" by the keenest of critics.

With the present tendency of literary investigation to devote almost all its time and labor to the searching out of the "sources" of poetical works, to seeking to trace to their origin all episodes, ideas and passages which a poet may have gathered in his reading of other poets and utilised in his own works, Falkenheim has little sympathy. Such studies frequently lead to the greatest absurdities, besides failing entirely to take into account the creative imagination of the poet. Aside from the fact, that various explanations may be frequently found for such similarities of thought and expression, we are not so much interested in knowing where the poet found his materials as in knowing what use he has made of them. A philosophical method of criticism puts a just estimate upon the value of such material; the philological method, as now applied, unduly magnifies its importance and is apt to mislead the student. It is a mistake

of the same general nature to group poets into "schools," to assert dogmatically the dependence of one poet upon another, to cite indiscriminately analogous and contradictory passages of the same or of different poets. All such practices are misleading, because they are apt to lose sight of the power of originality in the poetic imagination.

Literary criticism, pure and simple, the third of the elements of literary judgment, when based upon careful preliminary historical and psychological analysis, is, according to Falkenheim, the consummation of literary investigation. For the history of literature "reaches its highest point when conceived of as the history of the development of national æsthetic ideals in the realm of poetry as reflected in the representative poets and their works." In practice, the process of passing judgment upon any author is as follows. First comes the critical estimate of his productions, an estimate corrected and ratified by the facts of his life, and then the author is assigned his proper rank amongst the poets of his nation. Therefore, purely literary criticism is the Alpha and the Omega of literary investigation.

Literary criticism requires taste and discrimination, intuitive æsthetic appreciation, a soul which is itself poetical. Mechanical dissection can never comprehend life. The first thing to be aimed at in the interpretation of any poem is to understand its spirit, its organic structure, and not, as the philologists of to-day would have it, its form or its style. Form is secondary to thought; the critic should pass criticism upon the *union of form and thought*, to explain how the poet cast into its harmonious form this creation of his "fine phrenzy."—Philology has its place in literary investigations, often the most important place, and should do the preliminary work in all literary study; but it ought not, on the ground of being the "exact" method, assert its superiority over all other methods, which, because they are not mechanical, it contemptuously calls unscientific. All honor is due to philology, because it has so rigidly insisted upon accuracy and attention to detail, but to-day it is lost in its details and fails to see the woods because of the trees.

The great objection urged against æsthetic

literary criticism is its indefiniteness. It cannot be defined exactly; it is difficult to resolve it into its elements, to establish canons of criticism which will be accepted by all. The objection is partly true, yet receives most of its support from mistakes of incapable critics. Scientific criticism requires a naturally critical mind educated in the principles of art and philosophy, trained by a study of artistic productions. There are general laws underlying all poetic creations according to which the poet's mind works and creates, and which it is the aim of æsthetics to discover in order to base upon them canons of criticism. There are certain of these views accepted by all writers in literary matters, for all make distinctions between greater and lesser poets, and none would think of chronicling *all* facts about *all* authors. The criticism of a poem requires more than mere analysis. Having penetrated to the heart of the poem and discovered the law of its organism, the critic should proceed to the reconstruction, the *synthesis*, of the poem according to its organic laws. In this process he can appreciate the value of its form, can judge whether form and thought are in harmony, can condemn such parts as are not in keeping with, or extraneous to, the rest of the poem.

Falkenheim sums up his results as follows:

"The justification of our method lies in the fact that while it attempts to find the solution of the problems of the history of literature by an analysis of the peculiar character and nature of this history, it avoids the one-sidedness of former methods, of which, however, it preserves the important features and which it takes up and embodies in newer and higher principles. . . . In such a method the spirit always counts for more than the letter."

He acknowledges that there are weak points in the method, that Kuno Fischer, its great exponent, is often one-sided, and, perhaps, dogmatic, but maintains that the method, if properly applied, is its own check.

Such, in the main, are the views of the author. Whatever opinion may be held of the worth and correctness of his views, the author is entitled to great praise for the honesty and fairness of his discussion; the clear, logical exposition of his views and his straightforward, agreeable style. Kuno Fischer, as the best

representative of the method, necessarily takes up a great deal of space in the discussion, and his books furnish many illustrative examples. The tone, however, in which the "master" is spoken of, is always moderate; there is in it the warm feeling of a devoted pupil towards his teacher, but nowhere fulsome flattery or dogmatic condemnation of dissenting opinions. The great merit of the book is, that it joins so vigorously and powerfully in the increasing protests against the mechanical, life-destroying methods of literary criticism which are prevalent in Germany and threaten to reduce the investigation and study of literature in our colleges and universities to the merest mechanical grubbing for facts, without any consideration of the thought and beauty of the poetic creations.

GUSTAV GRUENER.

Yale University.

ICELANDIC LEXICOGRAPHY.

Ordförrådet i de äldsta isländska handskrifterna leksikaliskt ock gramatiskt ordnat av Dr. LUDVIG LARSSON. Lund: Ph. Lindstedts Universitets-Bokhandel. 1891, 4to, pp. v, 438.

DR. LARSSON'S work is a decidedly valuable addition to Icelandic lexicography, filling a want that had long been felt. It contains complete references to all forms occurring in the following MSS. :

1. Reykjaholts máldage, or máldagi, as it is written in the MS. itself.
2. Arnamagnsan MS., 237 fol.
3. The oldest portion of Codex 1812, 4to, Gl. Kong. Saml.
4. The glossaries in the Arnamag. MS., 249 fol.
5. 15, 4to, Stockholm. Book of Homilies.
6. Fragments of "Phisiologus, Arnamag." MS., 673 A, 4to.
7. The older portion of Arnamag. MS., 645, 4to.
8. Arnamag. MS., 674, 4to, A.
9. " " 673, 4to, B.
10. " " 315, fol. D.

The last three MSS. contain respectively *Eleucidarius*, *Placitusdrápa* and *Grágás*.

Some idea of the magnitude of the work and the minuteness of its execution can be formed from the statement that the references to the single word *at* in its various uses cover over twelve columns, one of these columns containing, by actual count, four hundred and twenty-five references, while the pronoun *sá* takes up twenty columns, or between eight and ten thousand references. The form of the catch words is normalized according to the oldest orthography that commonly occurs in the MSS., while the different forms of the same word are arranged according to their age, and when this is the same the least abbreviated form is given first. The different MSS. are, furthermore, treated separately, convenient abbreviations being employed to distinguish them. At the back of the book are lists of foreign proper names and common nouns that do not receive Icelandic inflectional endings. Finally, all the native words occurring in the dictionary are grammatically arranged in accordance with Noreen's 'Alt-isländische und altnorvegische Grammatik.' This is especially valuable in connection with the nouns.

A careful comparison of the words under the letter *A* with those occurring in Vigfussen's Dictionary shows the following omissions and errors in the latter and, at the same time, indicates the usefulness of Larsson's work, especially for grammatical purposes:—

akenningr, masc., given only as fem., -*ing*.
aldentré, *algeorva*, *almíldr*, *ástfræmcona*,
ástþugr (*ástarhúgr*, however, is given by V.),
ástskýrpr, *astvitispr*.

As the value of a work of this kind depends entirely upon the correctness of its references, I have compared the forms occurring in the Icelandic-Latin glossary, numbered Gl. ii., with Dr. Larsson's transcriptions, and for want of a more complete comparison, this may be taken as a fair test of the compiler's skill. The forms are cited from the edition published in "Smaastykker" of the society for the publication of Old Norse Literature, 1884, by Gudmund Þorláksson. This particular work was chosen mainly on account of its shortness. Under '*af*, casus osäker,' it should be noted that the case, dative sing., is given in the